



STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM—
INFORMATION CENTERS

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
PURSUANT TO
S. Res. 40

PART 8

JULY 14, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

NOV 4 1953

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

FRANCIS D. FLANAGAN, *Chief Counsel*
WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

ROY M. COHN, *Chief Counsel*
FRANCIS P. CARR, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Index -----	Page I
Testimony of—	
Huberman, Leo-----	486
O'Connor, Harvey-----	484



STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM— INFORMATION CENTERS

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 1953

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:45 a. m., pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, agreed to January 30, 1953, in room 318 of the Senate Office Building, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Joseph R. McCarthy (Republican, Wisconsin), Karl E. Mundt (Republican, South Dakota), Everett McKinley Dirksen (Republican, Illinois).

Present also: Roy Cohn, chief counsel; Daniel Buckley, assistant counsel; David Schine, chief consultant; Ruth Young Watt, chief clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Senator Potter asked that we put in the record the fact that he was at the executive session this morning and is now over at a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, meeting on a matter pertaining to the Maritime Commission, and will be in later.

Last week, we announced that Allen Dulles would appear this morning and go into the question of whether he objected to having members of the CIA subpoenaed by this committee. Since that time we have had some contacts with Mr. Dulles. I talked to him last night. I talked to some of his representatives later. The committee, I believe, recognizes his problem fully, and I think he recognizes the problem of the committee also. Number one, we realize that he does have a security problem. We have not proposed to question any CIA members about their work in the CIA. We have, however, subpoenaed a man, Bundy, who had been proposed for a job as liaison between the National Security Council and the Atomic Energy Commission. There has been no proposal to question him about his work in the CIA, but merely to question him about his connections with Alger Hiss, his Communist-front activities, which are very clearly documented. This fellow, Bundy, gave \$400 to Hiss for his defense; stated that he thought it was imperative that Hiss be cleared; stated that he was doing it to help out his father-in-law, Acheson. And from the preliminary talks which we have had with Mr. Dulles' organization, I feel that they agree with us that the Congress should be entitled to subpoena any witness where you have evidence of graft, corruption, or subversion. At the same time, they do not want to endanger any of their undercover agents, in any of their operations.

We are now trying to work out a formula with Mr. Dulles whereby the Congress can get the information to which it is entitled without in any way adversely affecting the Intelligence Agency.

I am meeting with Mr. Dulles this afternoon at 3 o'clock.

Senator Mundt, do you have anything to add on that matter?

Senator MUNDT. No; except that I express the confidence that at the meeting this afternoon we will be able to work out some formula of cooperation with the CIA which will protect its interests and also protect the rights of Congress and enable us to carry out our responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is your first witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. COHN. Harvey O'Connor, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'Connor, will you take the witness chair?

You are reminded, Mr. O'Connor, that you were administered the oath this morning. You are still under oath.

Mr. Counsel, will you identify yourself?

Mr. BOUDIN. Leonard B. Boudin, of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. You are the same Leonard Boudin who defended Judy Coplon; are you not?

Mr. BOUDIN. I didn't understand that I was called as a witness, Mr. McCarthy.

The CHAIRMAN. Just for the record.

Mr. BOUDIN. Is that necessary? Is it usual for counsel to have attributed to him all the other clients he has had?

The CHAIRMAN. You need not answer any questions.

Mr. BOUDIN. I am not answering any questions. I think the question is improper, and I don't know why you are asking it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Counsel, just for the identification of the attorney, Is this the same counsel who defended Judy Coplon?

Mr. COHN. That is a matter of record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'Connor, you have been subpoenaed here today to answer questions in regard to the writings which were purchased by the old Acheson State Department. Before we ask you any questions, may I ask:

Mr. Cohn, has it been established and confirmed by the State Department that Mr. O'Connor's writings have been purchased and have been distributed in various information centers throughout the world?

Mr. COHN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, Mr. O'Connor, we will ask you this question: At the time you wrote the books which were purchased by the old State Department, were you then a member of the Communist Party?

TESTIMONY OF HARVEY O'CONNOR (ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, LEONARD B. BOUDIN)

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement?

The CHAIRMAN. No. You will answer the question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. About my objection to the jurisdiction of this committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you may make a statement on that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Thank you.

Under the first amendment to the Constitution, my writings, my books, and my political opinions are of no legitimate concern to this

committee. If I have violated any laws in the writings that I have written, that is a proper concern for the law enforcement agencies and not the proper concern of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you get nearer to the microphone, Mr. O'Connor, so that we can hear you?

Mr. O'CONNOR. My second point would be that this committee has no right to inquire into my writings, under the point of the constitutional limitations on the powers of Congress and its committees. I might say in that regard that I have not known until this moment that my books were in overseas libraries, and most certainly I had nothing whatever to do with their selection there.

In the third place, I would object to the authority of the committee, under the statute by which it was created by Congress, to inquire into my writing or my political views.

The CHAIRMAN. Just for your information, Mr. O'Connor, we are not concerned with any political views of yours. We would not be concerned about your writings. You are entitled to write whatever you care to write. Any American or anyone else is entitled to purchase your books, your writings. You are here this morning because your writings were purchased by the old Acheson State Department, distributed throughout the world, ostensibly for the purpose of fighting communism. Now, when the taxpayers pay for your books, when the royalties of your books, paid by the taxpayer, go into the Communist coffers, then this committee is concerned with that. For that reason, I again ask you the question: At the time you wrote the books which were purchased with taxpayers' money and put in our information libraries throughout the world, at that time were you a member of the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I object to the question on the three grounds I have already stated.

The CHAIRMAN. You can object. Now you will answer, unless you feel that the answer will tend to incriminate you.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not feel that the answer will tend to incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are ordered to answer.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have already answered.

The CHAIRMAN. I apparently did not hear your answer then.

You are ordered to answer whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. O'CONNOR. On the three grounds I have stated, I have declined to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have the record clear, so that we will know what you have declined to answer. I will repeat the question. At the time you wrote the books which were purchased by the old Acheson State Department and distributed in our information centers, were you a member of the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. O'CONNOR. My political affiliations or lack of political affiliations are no legitimate concern of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Apparently.

The CHAIRMAN. Not "apparently." Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I refuse to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not refusing on the ground that the answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not asserting the privilege against self-incrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not asserting the privilege against self-incrimination. All right. You may step down.

Incidentally, I think Senator Mundt wishes that a meeting of the subcommittee be called to have this man immediately cited for contempt. I will call a meeting of the subcommittee at the earliest convenience for that purpose.

Your other witness, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. Mr. Leo Huberman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

In this matter in hearing before the committee, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I do.

May I request that the lights be turned off, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The witness asks that the lights be turned off. He is entitled to have them turned off.

Mr. Counsel, will you proceed?

Mr. COHN. May we have your full name, please?

TESTIMONY OF LEO HUBERMAN (ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JOSEPH SHARFSIN)

Mr. HUBERMAN. Leo Huberman.

Mr. COHN. By the way, could we get the name of counsel for the record?

Mr. SHARFSIN. Joseph Sharfsin, S-h-a-r-f-s-i-n, of Philadelphia.

Mr. COHN. And where do you reside, Mr. Huberman?

Mr. HUBERMAN. 66 Barrow Street, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt? I do not believe you have been before the committee before, Mr. Counsel. So that you may know the rules of the committee: You are entitled to advise your client at any time you see fit.

Mr. SHARFSIN. I have been before the committee.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Huberman, are you the author of America, Incorporated?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes; I am.

Mr. COHN. Are you the author of Man's Worldly Goods?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Are you the author of We, the People?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Are you the author of the Truth About Unions?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Right.

Mr. COHN. They have all four of those books in use in the State Department information program?

Mr. SCHINE. Yes.

Mr. COHN. And are you the author of the Truth About Socialism?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes.

Mr. COHN. Is that book in use as well?

Mr. SCHINE. Yes; it is.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Chairman, all of these books are in use. In the case of one of them, over 100 copies were purchased by the old team in the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know whether those books are still in the libraries?

Mr. COHN. We haven't gotten any authoritative information on that, but from what we do know they are still in there.

Mr. Huberman, these books you have written are in use and wide use in the State Department information centers as part of a program to furnish information about the American way of life in our form and system of government. I want to ask you this. Do you believe in our form of government? Do you believe in capitalism?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Do I believe what?

Mr. COHN. Do you believe in capitalism?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I shall decline to answer that question.

Mr. COHN. On what ground?

Mr. HUBERMAN. On several grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you speak a little louder, Mr. Huberman, so that we can hear you?

Mr. HUBERMAN. The question invades my freedom of conscience, belief, and thought, which is protected against official intrusion by the first amendment. The question curtails my rights as an author to freedom of speech and of the press, and it thereby tends to curb not only my own freedom but that of all other writers. The question is outside the scope of the authority of this committee as defined by the statutory provision which created it and as permitted by the Constitution.

Mr. COHN. You assert no privilege under the fifth amendment; is that right?

Mr. HUBERMAN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. You are ordered to answer. And for your information, may I say the committee has no concern whatsoever with any of your beliefs, any of your writings, except insofar as those writings are purchased by the taxpayers who are our bosses and distributed ostensibly for the purpose of fighting communism. And as long as we purchase your works and distribute them throughout the world—will you listen to me? As long as we purchase your works and distribute them throughout the world with the stamp of approval of our Government, then we are interested in knowing whether or not you espouse the Communist cause, whether you believe in our system of Government. Whether our system is right or wrong, the point is that the American people apparently believe in it. And if they purchase the works of a man who does not believe in it, who is trying to destroy this form of government, they are entitled to know that. For that reason you will be required to answer all of the questions that are pertinent, unless you feel that a truthful answer might tend to incriminate you.

You were asked the question: Do you believe in our system of government? You will be ordered to answer that, unless you feel the answer might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. HUBERMAN. Isn't that another question?

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask that question: Do you believe in our form of government?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes; I do.

Senator MUNDT. May I ask you this, Mr. Huberman: Did you write a book called America, Incorporated?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes; I did.

Senator MUNDT. On page 233 of that book I find this statement: "America is suffering from only one disease, capitalism." Did you write that statement?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes. I am a Marxist and a Socialist.

Senator MUNDT. You are a Marxist and a Socialist?

Mr. HUBERMAN. That is right.

Senator MUNDT. I know what you mean by a Socialist, but when you say "a Marxist and a Socialist," to me that means you are a Communist and a Socialist. Does that mean the same to you?

Mr. HUBERMAN. No; it does not.

Senator MUNDT. Will you explain what it does mean?

Mr. HUBERMAN. It would be very difficult to explain what Marxism means.

Senator MUNDT. I do not want another book, but I want a kind of a brief answer, because if you simply say, "I am a Socialist," that I understand; but you say, "I am a Marxist and a Socialist"; so that, I suppose, is something beyond the kind of socialism that Norman Thomas is identified with.

Mr. HUBERMAN. It would be impossible for me to tell you briefly what a Marxist is. It would take me 10 lectures.

Senator MUNDT. Let me put it this way, then. To you, at least, when you say, "I am a Marxist and a Socialist," it does not mean what it means to me when you say, "I am a Marxist and a Socialist."

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes; I am a Marxist and a Socialist, and like millions of other non-Communists throughout the world, I believe in working, together with others, including Communists, to the extent that their aims and methods coincide with mine.

Senator MUNDT. How large an extent is that? Are they identical?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I am not a member of the Communist Party, and what I do believe is explained in my books and writings, and I stand behind them.

May I read a short statement, sir?

Senator MUNDT. I would like to have you answer some questions first. I think we will let you read the statement in due course if it is short.

Mr. HUBERMAN. It is short.

Senator MUNDT. Your books, you must agree, are rather voluminous, and I have not read them. So I am trying to interrogate you and get answers of comparative brevity as to just what distinction you draw between being a Marxist and a Communist. You say you are not a Communist.

Mr. HUBERMAN. That is right.

Senator MUNDT. Do you mean that you are not only not a member of the Communist Party but that you do not associate yourself with the Communist creed or doctrine?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I have just said, in answer to a previous question, that I have on occasion associated myself in the sense of working together with Communists to the extent that their aims and methods coincide with my own.

Senator MUNDT. Will you pull the microphone up a little nearer? I did not hear you.

Maybe we can approach the question this way, Mr. Huberman. I asked you whether your views were identical with those of communism, and I think your answer implies that they are not. Will you give us

some idea as to how your ideas differ from those of communism? I think that would clarify the question.

Mr. HUBERMAN. May I read my statement, which will then clarify the point?

Senator MUNDT. Well, I would like to get your answers to the questions, and then you can read your statement in due course.

Mr. HUBERMAN. The statement will clarify it.

Senator MUNDT. This is a very easy question to answer. You can read that portion of your statement which points out where you deviate from the Communist viewpoint, if you care to.

Mr. HUBERMAN. I am a writer and editor. I have no other occupation and no other source of income.

Senator MUNDT. I just want you to read the part of your statement now that answers the question. How do your viewpoints deviate from those of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I shall refuse to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. On what grounds?

Mr. HUBERMAN. If I may read the statement, I will give the grounds. On the stated grounds.

Senator MUNDT. On what?

Mr. HUBERMAN. On the stated grounds previously given.

Senator MUNDT. Give them again, because I did not hear you.

Mr. HUBERMAN. The question invades my freedom of conscience, belief, and thought, which is protected against official intrusion by the first amendment. The question curtails my rights as an author to freedom of speech and of the press, and it thereby tends to curb not only my own freedom but that of all other writers.

Senator MUNDT. May I point out that my question has in no way curbed your freedom of speech. I am trying to induce you to use your freedom of speech.

Mr. HUBERMAN. May I ask a question, Senator?

The CHAIRMAN. May you what?

Mr. HUBERMAN. May I ask a question?

Senator MUNDT. Not until you answer this question. This book is Man's Wordly Goods. Did you write this book?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I did.

Senator MUNDT. I quote to you a statement that appears in your book on page 241:

One answer commonly made by revolutionists is that force must be used, blood must flow, not because they want to use violence but because the ruling class will not give up without it. There is a strong case for that argument.

Are you thereby advocating the use of force and violence to overthrow our way of government, as it seems to me you clearly indicate in the statement?

First of all, did you write the statement?

Mr. HUBERMAN. If you say it is in the book, I wrote it.

Senator MUNDT. I am quoting it.

Mr. HUBERMAN. Right. I wrote it.

Senator MUNDT. Are you implying that what we need is force and violence in this country to change our system over to what you would call Marxism and Socialism?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I decline to discuss contents of my books and other writings before this committee, whose purpose, it seems to me, is not

to discuss the books as books but to probe into my political views. I have written only what I believe to be true, and I am glad to let readers judge any passage, including the one you just quoted, in its proper context.

Senator MUNDT. Let me ask you another question, before you get to your statement. Do you feel that a statement such as I have just read is a good piece of salesmanship for the Acheson State Department to purchase with American taxpayers' money for the purpose of convincing foreigners that we have a good way of life in this country which they might want to emulate?

Mr. HUBERMAN. It is my job as a writer to write the truth, to write books with scholarship and accuracy, and then my responsibility ends. Whether or not a book appears in the State Department library is by no stretch of the imagination any concern of mine. I didn't know these books were in the State Department library.

May I finish, please?

My responsibility as a writer ends with the preparation of the book to the best of my ability in regard to truth, accuracy, and style.

Now, at that point it is up to competent experts to judge whether or not the book should be in this or that or the other library.

Senator MUNDT. I agree with all of that. But now I am asking you a question, as probably the world's best expert on this book, because you wrote it: whether you feel that is the kind of book that the taxpayers might rightfully be asked to support in trying to sell the American way of life to people in foreign countries.

Mr. HUBERMAN. By my definition of the American way of life, that book, chosen by competent experts, properly belongs in the library, unless the converse of that would be that the American way of life has one particular line and only certain books shall be in it. I do not think that books should be chosen by a political test. They should be chosen by experts competent in their field. If that was done in this case, the book properly belongs there.

May I read my statement?

Senator MUNDT. I think the committee may have some other questions to ask.

Mr. HUBERMAN. Senator McCarthy, I was here in this room last week when you told the witness it was the rule of this committee that you would allow a statement to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Anything you want to say, you can say. You will have an opportunity to do it. There are certain questions you will be asked to answer first.

Now, Senator Mundt asked you a question as to whether or not at the time you wrote these books which were purchased by the old Acheson State Department, you in any way deviated from the teachings of communism, and in what way you deviated. I believe you refused to answer that. I will re-ask the question now, and I would like to have the grounds upon which you refuse to answer.

Mr. HUBERMAN. I would like respectfully to suggest that you are changing the rules here; as I understood it, having answered the question as to whether or not I was a member of the Communist Party, I was to be allowed to read my statement. This I heard you say was the rule of the committee. I would like to suggest therefore that I be allowed to read my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You will answer the questions first or refuse to answer them on the grounds they might incriminate you. You said you were a Marxist. Senator Mundt asked you a very simple question. He asked you whether you had deviated in any way from the teachings of communism at the time you wrote these books, books purchased by the taxpayers, books distributed by our Government throughout the world to teach the American way of life. You are ordered to answer that question, unless you feel that the answer might tend to incriminate you.

Mr. HUBERMAN. I respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds stated, which do not include the ground that the answer would incriminate me.

Mr. SHARFSIN. Senator, may I—

The CHAIRMAN. You may only advise your client.

Mr. SHARFSIN. I was asking your indulgence in the interest of clarifying something, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. You may do that.

Mr. SHARFSIN. I think it is clear both from your question—

The CHAIRMAN. If you are asking a question, you may proceed. I will not hear a speech from you. Did you have some question to ask to clarify this for the benefit of your client, to protect your client's rights? You may do that.

Mr. SHARFSIN. Is the question propounded by you and Senator Mundt directed at this witness for the purpose eliciting from him what his beliefs are, what his opinions are? I don't think that is quite clear, sir. And I think that his refusal to answer is based upon his understanding that your question probes the questions relating to his beliefs. And he invokes the first amendment, the clear, simple language of the first amendment, with respect to that.

Now, with respect to passages read out of context, necessarily so, from one of his books, Mr. Huberman's position is that the books are there and speak for themselves. His expression of opinion as to whether or not—

The CHAIRMAN. You said you were going to ask a question. We will not hear any speech from you.

Mr. SHARFSIN. Yes. The question is whether the question seeks to probe what his political or social beliefs are. Because that is the basis upon which he seeks to invoke the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. We will give your client that information.

As I have stated before, we do not care what his beliefs are except insofar as he tries to put those beliefs in a book which is purchased by our taxpayers.

My question is: At the time that he wrote the books, did he believe in communism? If not, to what extent did he deviate from it?

Mr. SHARFSIN. You are asking what he believes, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear no more from you. Your client will either answer, or he may refuse to answer on the ground that the answer might incriminate him.

Mr. SHARFSIN. Your indulgence for just a moment, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

(Mr. Sharfsin confers with Mr. Huberman.)

Mr. HUBERMAN. Implicit in your question—

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mundt has some questions.

Senator MUNDT. Let me ask you this question. You wrote a book called the Truth About Socialism. Right?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. And on page 176 I find this statement. I want to ask you whether you wrote it.

Now we need no longer guess whether or not it is possible for a nation to have centralized planning. Now we know. The Soviet Union has tried it. It works. It is possible.

Did you write that statement?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I did.

Senator MUNDT. At the time you wrote it, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUBERMAN. At the time what? I am sorry.

Senator MUNDT. At the time you wrote it, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I have never been a member of the Communist Party.

May I read my statement, sir?

Senator MUNDT. Eventually. But do not interrupt all my questions by asking to read your statement.

Mr. HUBERMAN. How long is "eventually"?

Senator MUNDT. Between now and 12 o'clock.

Mr. HUBERMAN. Thank you.

Senator MUNDT. How long is the statement?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Very short. Three pages.

Senator MUNDT. Now I want to ask you another matter of opinion. We are dealing here with a process under the law where certain Government officials, those in the State Department, were authorized under the law to purchase books for specific purposes, those purposes being to explain the American foreign policy and the American system of government and the American way of life to foreign people; the purpose also being implicit in the law that the purchase of the books was to be in part the fighting of the Communist conspiracy emanating from Moscow.

I want to ask you, as the world's best expert on this book, whether in your opinion the circulation of that book abroad would help fight communism and help convince people that communism is not an acceptable and a satisfactory way of life. This book was distributed in 27 different countries. Mr. Acheson's team bought 114 copies. The American taxpayers paid for it. I have read what you said. You have admitted that you said it. I am asking you a question which you may refuse to answer if you want to. It is, frankly, a matter of opinion. But you are an expert on the book.

In your opinion, would that book help fight communism?

Mr. HUBERMAN. Since it is a matter of opinion, I take the position that I refuse to answer. I decline to answer, on the matter of opinion.

May I read my statement?

Senator MUNDT. I suggest you let him read his statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I am getting rather curious about the statement. Go ahead and read it.

How many pages do you have, incidentally?

Mr. HUBERMAN. About two and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. May I say that we are violating the rules of the committee in allowing you to read it. The rules under the Reorganization Act provide that a statement must be submitted 72 hours before the witness appears. We have liberalized that rule and provided that you must submit the statement 24 hours before you appear. However, if the Senators have no objection, we will let you read it. We will waive the rule and let you read the statement.

Senator MUNDT. I presume that there are no matters of opinion expressed in the statement, because you apparently are very reluctant to testify to any matters of opinion.

Mr. HUBERMAN. I am a writer and editor. I have no other occupation and no other source of income.

Senator MUNDT. May I inquire at that point: What do you edit?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I am coming to that. If you will let me read the statement, a lot will be clear.

Senator MUNDT. Very good.

Mr. HUBERMAN. I have written eight books and many pamphlets and at present I am occupied full-time as coeditor, with Paul M. Sweezy, of *Monthly Review*—An Independent Socialist magazine which is published in New York City.

My ideas are best indicated in the subtitle of the magazine—Independent Socialist. I have never been a member of the Communist Party. However, like millions of other non-Communists throughout the world, I am a Marxist and a Socialist and believe in working together with others, including Communists, to the extent that their aims and methods are consistent with mine.

I have never sought to conceal what I think or where I stand. My Socialist principles were fully set forth in the first issue of *Monthly Review*—May 1949—and have been reprinted in its pages from time to time. I am anxious that my ideas and beliefs should be known to as many people as possible; anyone interested in them can readily satisfy his curiosity by reading my books and *Monthly Review*. I have nothing to hide, quite the contrary.

So much I have stated under oath, not because I concede the right of this committee to ask for such information, but because I want to make it crystal clear that communism is not an issue in this case and to focus attention on what is the issue—my right as an author and editor to pursue my occupation without interference from Congress or any of its committees. To assert this right, I have refused to answer any further questions put to me by the McCarthy committee concerning what I think, or what I believe, or with whom I associate. That, in accordance with good old American tradition, is my own business—to be discussed only with whom I choose. I do not choose to discuss it with the McCarthy committee. These are my reasons:

First, my freedom as a writer and editor, and that of all other writers and editors, is fully protected from congressional interference by the first amendment to the Constitution. Hence, to the extent that the purpose of the questions put to me by the committee is, as I am convinced it has been in the past, to invade that freedom by frightening or discouraging me and others from its full exercise, the committee is violating the Constitution and I refuse to be a party to such a proceeding.

Second, this committee, as I understand its enabling resolution, is charged with investigating matters relating to the spending of Gov-

ernment funds. Conducting such investigations is obviously a proper and necessary function of Congress, and in discharging this function Congress has the right to require the cooperation of any citizen who is in a position to help. But I am not an expert in this field; I have never been on the Government payroll; I have never disbursed Government funds; and no one has ever consulted me about the disbursement of Government funds. Moreover, I deny that the fact that Government funds have been spent to buy a book or books of mine—if it is a fact—constitutes a valid ground for the committee's calling me to testify. Hence, to the extent that the committee asks questions relating to me as an author and editor, it is acting beyond its powers and I refuse to be a party to such a proceeding.

These, then, are my reasons for refusing to answer questions about ideas, beliefs, and associations put to me by this committee. I do not believe that the committee has the right, under the Constitution or under its enabling resolution, to ask such questions. I refuse to be a party to what I consider to be unconstitutional and illegal proceedings.

But my motives are much broader. The problem at issue here is not solely one of legality. Also at stake are the preservation of traditional American liberties and the good name of our country in the eyes of the whole world.

A manifesto voted by the American Library Association on June 25, and concurred in by the American Book Publishers Council, opens with these words:

The freedom to read is essential to our democracy. It is under attack.

Everyone knows that the main attacker is this committee of Congress and its chairman.

A resolution, unanimously adopted by the National Education Association on June 30—

condemns the efforts of those who advocate book burnings, purges, or other devices which restrict freedom of thought and which are, in effect, an expression of lack of confidence in the integrity, loyalty, and good judgment of the American people.

Everyone knows that this forthright resolution is aimed at this committee of Congress and its chairman.

No less a personage than the President of the United States has recently felt it necessary to denounce the book burners as a menace to this country and its democratic institutions. Everyone knows that the chief book burner is this committee of Congress and its chairman.

Warnings and denunciations such as these are welcome signs of a growing revulsion against book burning in all its forms. But what is really needed is action. Ultimately, action will have to come from the voters of the country, and I am confident that it will. But, in the meantime, I am convinced that even an individual can, by standing up for his rights under the Constitution and the law, issue an effective challenge to the congressional book burners. I firmly believe that their methods constitute an abuse and usurpation of power. I refuse to cooperate with them. My refusal is based, in the words of Dr. Albert Einstein:

on the assertion that it is shameful for a blameless citizen to submit to such an inquisition and that this kind of inquisition violates the spirit of the Constitution.

In the event that my refusal leads to a judicial test, I stand ready to carry the case up to the Supreme Court so that the important constitutional questions involved herein, may be decided.

Senator MUNDT. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I make a statement?

The CHAIRMAN. You may.

Senator MUNDT. Have you concluded your statement, Mr. Huberman?

Mr. HUBERMAN. I have.

Senator MUNDT. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that this witness has answered the question which was asked him directly as to whether or not he is or has ever been a member of the Communist Party. He has answered that question in the negative. He has read us a statement of opinion, in which I am not particularly interested, because being a Marxist and a Socialist, he expresses opinions which are obviously contrary to viewpoints that anybody holds who believes in our American concepts of freedom, individual ownership, and human liberty.

I would like to point out, however, that this witness demonstrates very clearly the importance of the function of this committee in making certain that the purposes of Public Law 402 are carried out in the expenditure of public funds. We have had from this witness an admission that he wrote the statements which have been quoted. In his own statement he advocates publicly Marxism and socialism. He tells us he is the editor of a book or a magazine that advocates that. He has a perfect right to engage in that kind of writing under our system of government, contrary to the rights which he would not have if he were attempting to oppose communism in a Communist country.

He has admitted in testimony here that he has written books which have been purchased by the Acheson State Department with taxpayers' money for distribution to information centers abroad, which in one instance advocate the overthrow of Government by force and violence, and which in another instance publicly and enthusiastically applaud the Russian regime, the system prevailing in Communist Russia, and in a third instance repeatedly find fault with every phase of American life.

In my opinion, the purchase of those books and the distribution of them in our information centers is in clear violation of the law as passed by the 80th Congress, and in my opinion it demonstrates clearly that those in charge of the book purchasing and distribution program and procedure are going to have to avoid the procurement, the purchase, and the distribution of books of this kind, unless by deliberate malfeasance they violate the intent of Congress in establishing these information libraries.

I am not interested in this man's opinion. I think he has demonstrated clearly that books of that kind have no place in information centers abroad financed by the American taxpayers' money. Insofar as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we dismiss this witness. We are not interested in his viewpoints or his opinions. By his testimony, he has helpfully proved the case of the committee, demonstrating that while people in this country have a right to write anything they care to and sell it any place they want to, public officials under Public Law 402 do not have the right to spend tax-

payers' money to distribute that kind of trash to our information centers overseas.

I suggest we dismiss the witness.

The CHAIRMAN. You may step down.

Would counsel, just to complete the record, read the various Communist activities it has been established that Mr. Huberman has been identified with?

Mr. COHN. Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges; Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy; Committee for the Reelection of Benjamin J. Davis on the Communist Party ticket in 1945; Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights; National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; writer for New Masses; writer for Science and Society; Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace; signer of open letter calling for cooperation with the Soviet Union; writer for Soviet Russia Today; supporter Communist bookshops; Win the Peace Conference.

These have been supplied to us from the indexes of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, each of these having been cited officially.

The CHAIRMAN. All of them have been cited officially as Communist fronts?

Mr. COHN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned until further call.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a. m., the hearing was recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.)

INDEX

	Page
Acheson	483-485, 490, 492, 495
America, Incorporated (book)	486, 487
American Book Publishers Council	494
American Library Association	494
Atomic Energy Commission (AEC)	483
Boudin, Leonard B.	484
Bridges, Harry	496
Bundy	483
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)	483, 484
CIA. (See Central Intelligence Agency.)	
Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges	496
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy	496
Committee for the Reelection of Benjamin J. Davis on the Communist Party Ticket in 1945	496
Communist Party	484, 485, 488-490, 492, 493, 495, 496
Communist Russia	495
Congress	483-485, 493, 494, 495
Constitution of the United States	484, 487, 493, 494
Coplon, Judy	484
Davis, Benjamin J.	496
Dulles, Allen	483, 484
Eightieth Congress	495
Einstein, Albert	494
Eisenhower, President	494
Government of the United States	487
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights	496
Hiss, Alger	483
House Committee on Un-American Activities (files)	496
Huberman, Leo, testimony of	486-496
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee	483
Man's Wordly Goods (book)	486, 489
Maritime Commission	483
Marx, Karl	488, 489, 491, 493, 495
Monthly Review (magazine)	493
Moscow	492
National Education Association	494
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	496
National Security Council	483
New Masses (publication)	496
O'Connor, Harvey, testimony of	484-486
Philadelphia	486
President of the United States	494
Public Law 402	495
Reorganization Act	493
Science and Society (publication)	496
Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace	496
Sharfsin, Joseph	486, 491
Socialist	488, 493, 495
Soviet Russia Today (publication)	496
Soviet Union	492, 496
State Department	484-487, 490, 492, 495
State Department (library)	490
Supreme Court of the United States	495
Sweezy, Paul M.	493
Thomas, Norman	488

	Page
Truth About Socialism (book)-----	486, 492
Truth About Unions (book)-----	486
Un-American Activities Committee (files)-----	496
United States Congress-----	483-485, 493, 494, 495
United States Constitution-----	484, 487, 493, 494
United States Government-----	487
United States Supreme Court-----	495
We, The People (book)-----	486
Win the Peace Conference-----	496



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3327

